

# Columbus Democrat.

VOL. 5.

COLUMBUS, MISSISSIPPI, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1838.

NO. 10.

## THE DEMOCRAT

18 PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY BY  
WORTHINGTON & LESTER  
Publishers of the United States Laws.

Democratic Candidate for United States Senator  
JAMES F. TROTTER, or LOWNDES.

For Representative.  
SAMUEL BUTLER.

We are authorized to announce Col. George R. Fall as a candidate for State Treasurer.

### THE TRUE ISSUE.

Shall ours be a GOVERNMENT OF THE BANKS, or a GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE? Shall we have a CONSTITUTIONAL TREASURY, or an UNCONSTITUTIONAL NATIONAL BANK? Shall we have a CONSTITUTIONAL CURRENCY OF GOLD AND SILVER, or one of IRREDEEMABLE PAPER? Shall we live under the dominion of a MONETED ARISTOCRACY, or under the safeguards of a FREE CONSTITUTION?—Washington Chron.

HENRY CLAY'S Declaration of War against the occupant and Pre-emption of Settlers.

"I did say the squatters on the public lands were a LAWLESS HABLE; that they might as well seize upon our forts and arsenals, or on the public treasury, as to rush out and seize on the public lands. I WILL OPPOSE THESE CLAIMS AS LONG AS GOD GIVES ME THE POWER AND ABILITY TO DO SO."—H. Clay's Speech on the pre-emption bill, January, 1838.

### BEWARE OF SHIN-PLASTERS!

"Let the laboring classes beware. The reign of shin-plasters is drawing to a close, and many are the poor and ignorant who will be caught in the trap. Every worthless set of paper now circulating, must finally stop somewhere! It will not stop in the hands of the rich and cautious! The hands of the laborer will be its resting place. Let the working classes beware. Let them begin to refuse all shillings. They can get silver if they refuse the shillings."—Globe.

Extract from the London Bankers' Circular of January 27th, 1837.

"From its nature, the influence of a bank must be limited to the aristocracy of wealth, and not to the democracy of numbers; and this is more especially the case with great chartered banks having immense power. The late bank of the U. States was one of this description, and its political influence was prodigious."

WHIG DOCTRINE.—Men have found that the chances of having a good chief magistrate by ballot are about equal to the chances of obtaining one by popular election. And hence we will, that the superior intelligence of our citizens may render this government an exception, TIME WILL SHOW THAT THIS IS A MISTAKE. No nation can be an exception, till the Almighty change the whole character of man.—Letter of Syney.

We have the pleasure of presenting to our readers to day the Address of the Democratic members of Congress to the People of the United States. It is a document fraught with the soundest views and the most convincing arguments. It embodies the genuine State right doctrine of '98. But it needs no commendation from us.—All that we ask for it is an attentive perusal. We will just observe that the principles which it advocates form the groundwork upon which all the measures and recommendations of the present Administration are based. As has been justly remarked, it holds out the olive branch to the dismembered fragments of the Jeffersonian party, on such grounds alone, as the south can unite upon with safety to itself.

Our Senator, Judge Trotter was a member of the meeting that adopted the Address, and heartily concurs in all its views.

As we wish the document circulated as extensively as possible, we shall strike off some thousand Extras containing it.

### To the Voters of Lowndes County.

#### FELLOW CITIZENS:—

The approaching election for member of the Legislature is one involving much interest, in consequence of the influence its result will tend to have on our National policy. As freemen, it is our duty at all times, but especially so now, to canvass the respective merits of men both personally and politically, who aspire to the honor of representing us in the legislature of our State, or in the councils of the nation—that we may find out as far as possible their views and motives, and cast our votes for him whose political sentiments are most likely in our opinions to maintain our civil and religious liberties.

It is with a view of bringing the claims and merits of the candidates fairly before you, that I am induced to give the reasons by which my vote shall be influenced.

The candidates before us are SETH PEEBLES and SAMUEL BUTLER.

In the capacity of private citizens they are on an equal footing; both men of good standing, respectable talents, and equally identified with the interests of the country,—but when viewed as politicians, we find them to be antipodes.—Mr. Peebles advocating the doctrines of the Federal, and Mr. Butler that of the Democratic party. The issue between them is, whether Federal Aristocratic principles shall prevail, by establishing a National Bank to manage the finances of the country and away the Government itself, or whether Democratic Republican principles shall be maintained in the attempt to organize a Government on the principles of the Constitution, and manage the public affairs independent of all Banks.

It behooves us fellow citizens, to pause and ponder well what the designs of the Federal party are! Can a person of unprejudiced mind, having the welfare of the nation at heart, consent to vote for any man who advocates measures tending directly to give the monied aristocracy of this country and of Europe control of so powerful political engine as a United States Bank has, and ever will be, when connected with the Government? I care not how it is guarded, it must ever

be dangerous to the liberties of the people, because from the very nature of a Bank, it must be controlled by a few men selected by the stockholders, who consist of foreigners that are educated to hate republican institutions, and of the capitalists of this country, who are almost invariably Federalists in favor of a strong Government, or in other words, a monarchical form with a veil of Republicanism thrown over it, to retain the external forms of our present institutions and the mere name of liberty! The president and directors of such a Bank must do as all other hirings do—obey the will of their masters, or else they will lose their places! When commanded, they must use their power to effect certain pecuniary and political objects. When it is necessary to bring a democratic President into disrepute, they must flood the country with their issues, which invariably produces a corresponding expansion on the part of the State Banks—then they must commence the most rigid system of contraction of their circulation; the State institutions are compelled to do so in self defence. This creates pecuniary distress and want of confidence throughout the land, all of which is attributed to the Administration by the service press in their employ. This was the course pursued by the denationalized Bank of Philadelphia in 1836, which in the short space of four months, increased its circulation from three to twenty millions of dollars and immediately after commenced the most rigid contraction! To this fact alone, is to be attributed most of the evils under which we are now suffering. Do those interested in the Bank lose by this movement? On the contrary; for those behind the screen know when to dispose of their property, that they may reinvest when the country is most depressed, and property much below its intrinsic value, so that by this one financial stroke of policy, they effect the double purpose of giving additional strength to the Federal party, and make money for their lords and masters in the expense of the honest and industrious, but unfortunately, the unwary portion of the people.

Much is and has been said by the organs of the Federal party of the great importance a National Bank has been to the country in consequence of its controlling both foreign and domestic exchanges, and always furnishing them at low rates, and one would suppose, who was not in possession of facts connected with this subject, that it is utterly impossible for them ever to be at such rates as could be borne by the people, without such an institution. This was the cry among the gentlemen of that party, as to foreign exchanges in particular at the called session of Congress in 1837, immediately after the general suspension of specie payments, when in consequence of the previous over-trading of the nation, exchanges were some twenty per cent in favor of Europe. But much to the disappointment of these orators, who would fain make you believe that a United States Bank is a panacea for all the evils of the nation at large, and for the individual losses of each citizen in it, it so happened that in the short space of three months after this state of things existed, that foreign exchange not only came down to par, but was actually some five or six per cent in favor of this country, a circumstance unparalleled during all the days of National Bank! At the last session of Congress this branch of their incantation, being cut off, the whole current of their woful strains had to run in the only channel left them, that of domestic exchanges, where one would think when listening to them, were never before denigrated, but that during the existence of a National Bank, all money exchanges were equal throughout the Union; but much to the discomfiture of these woful orators, we find on comparing the prices current of the years 1825 and '26, (a period when the United States Bank was at the meridian height of its glory and power) with those of 1835, that between all the States in the Union, exchanges are at lower rates now than they were then, with the exception of four States only! I think I may safely predict that one year will not elapse before a general resumption of specie payments will take place throughout the Union, when domestic exchanges will be furnished at as low rates by State Banks as they ever have been by a United States Bank. Even now, exchange is only one per cent between Ohio and Philadelphia, and one and a half between Ohio and New York, which is as low as it ever had been during the palmiest days of the great regulator!

By what moral right, does the Federal party demand a National Bank? Do they consult the welfare of the nation in making it? In my opinion any reflecting mind must decide against them. Then let me ask what is the great object so much sought for in obtaining it? Power! yes, power to control the councils of the nation, and to rivet the bonds of commercial vassalage which the South has heretofore been under to the North, which they can alone effect through the instrumentality of a United States Bank! This, fellow citizens is the leading measure of the party to which Mr. PEEBLES belongs, and he has pledged himself repeatedly to vote for no man who may offer for the office of United States Senator (should he be elected) that does not pledge himself to advocate this measure!

Is not ours a representative Government? Is it not composed of the representatives of the people, who swear to support the Constitution of the United States? Did not our forefathers pledge "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor," to defend inviolate the principles of the declaration of independence, which were perpetuated by the adoption of that Constitution, until it was changed by the constitutional vote of the people? Until such change is made, it declares any act of Congress coming in conflict with its provisions to be null and void. Such was the profound wisdom of its framers, that it has not been deemed expedient during the lapse of more than half a century to make any alteration in it. This Constitution gives the express power to Congress to make and regulate the value of coins—it makes gold and silver coins at the valuation placed on them by Congress, the only lawful tender, and from beginning to end of this legacy of the combined wisdom of our patriotic ancestors, there is not one word or sentence that any man of common sense can torture into a National Bank. It is true that such an institution has been resorted to in cases of emergency, and that it received the sanction of Mr. Madison, but that patriotic and truly great man was most violently opposed to it on the ground of its unconstitutionality, and only yielded his opinion in consequence of the embarrassed condition of the Treasury after the late

war,—he stated positively that as a mere matter of expediency he could not consent to it, but that it was alone as a last resort to create funds to carry on the Government that induced him to give his consent. Can the Federal party of this day ask it as a matter of necessity, or even of expediency! The overflowing condition of the Treasury gives them the lie! Then, with these facts before the present administration acting under the solemnity of an oath to maintain the Constitution of the United States, could they consent to recommend or advocate that the irredeemable paper of Banks should be received in payment of public dues, when the fact was known to them from their own returns, that they had seven to eight dollars of paper representing one dollar in specie? What guarantee is there that the same will not be the case again and again? There is none whatever.

The Federal Government has not attempted to interfere in the great struggle between Bank and anti-Bank opinions; all it asks is, that it may be allowed the privilege of occupying strictly neutral ground, and that it will be allowed to discharge its federal duties on stricter principles of limitation of construction and of action than has heretofore been possible since the fatal Hamiltonian ascendancy—leaving each State to regulate and reform its local institutions and local currency on its own principles. It was with this view that the Sub-Treasury bill was introduced; it was for the purpose of collecting the revenues of the country in the only currency recognized by the Constitution, the only one possessing intrinsic and uniform value, safe from depreciation—economical on compulsion, from the very nature of that medium rendering any large redundancy of revenue, impossible. The revenues of the country being collected alone in gold and silver would have a most salutary effect as a check on the banking institutions of the country, as it would create at all times a moderate demand for the precious metals, thereby preventing those who govern local banks from forgetting as they heretofore almost have done that it is necessary their paper should represent some specie and prevent the nation at large from falling into the belief that this is exclusively the age of paper.

Our present United States Senator and candidate for re-election, the Hon. JAMES F. TROTTER, has boldly and fearlessly stood by that band of patriots under the broad folds of the constitution, who are determined on carrying out the acknowledged intention of the "hard money men" who framed it, or sink with the ship, of State rather than yield to the Bank influence brought to bear on that body! Since he has served us in the capacity of Senator he has pursued the same even tenor of his way, never losing sight either of the interest of the nation or that of his State, opposing with all his power the chartering of a National Bank, both on the grounds of expediency and unconstitutionality, and also as a southerner who wishes to see the south import the articles it consumes and export its own productions, the profits arising from which, we know from sad experience we have been deprived of, owing to the great facilities afforded to the northern merchants by the United States Bank, almost to the exclusion of those of the South. Through his exertions we have obtained a United States District court for the northern portion of the State—through his exertions a bill was introduced and passed through the Senate to continue the commission established by the act of 1836, to adjust the claims to reservations under the 14th article of the Choctaw treaty of 1830—through his exertions a new land district was established for the accommodation of the people of the southern part of the State. The bill to confirm the purchases made under the pre-emption act of 1831, by which the land of many worthy citizens of this and adjoining counties will be secured and which would otherwise have been lost to them, was proposed and introduced by him—the bill to authorize the State of Mississippi to invest the two per cent fund belonging to the State, was through his efforts alone passed through the Senate—the bill for a grant of land to Mississippi for one million and nearly 50,000 acres of lands which was read the 1st and 2nd time, referred to the committee on public lands and returned—about amendment was introduced by him—by his efforts a private bill for the relief of Alvin Fisk, the object of which was to refund him some five thousand dollars with interest paid for land not subject at the time to private entry, was passed through the Senate, and by him, was brought forward sundry resolutions for the establishment of some thirty five new mail routes, &c. &c. This is the man who some of the Federal party of this county have the hardihood to say has done nothing for his State since he became a member of the Senate! I defy any whig or Democrat in this State to say, that they ever applied to him to attend to any of their private affairs in any of the departments, that did not meet with prompt and satisfactory attention, notwithstanding the unparalleled amount of private business which devolved for some time on him alone to attend to.

Can you, fellow citizens, forget the untiring zeal with which Judge Trotter has discharged his duties towards you and the nation whilst United States Senator! Can you forget the faithful manner in which he has always discharged the duties of a public officer? I cannot and will not believe that the yeomanry of Lowndes, will ever prove ungrateful for past services or allow to pass unrewarded his moral worth and merit.

In voting for Samuel Butler, you vote for a man who has once voted for Judge Trotter, and who, if elected, will do so again; in voting for him you vote for a man whose character as a judicious legislator is established by the experience of the past—for one who is opposed to the chartering of Banks either State or National when connected with the government, and whose untiring efforts will be directed towards improving the condition of our currency.—In voting for SETH PEEBLES, you vote for a man of whose capacity as a legislator nothing is known—in voting for him, you vote for one in favor of an increase of Banks in this State, the consequence of which is, the further depreciation of our currency and the continuance of the reign of Shin Plasters, and in voting for him, you vote for a United States Bank, the ally of the abolitionists of the north, who now rest the hopes of their mad schemes succeeding, through the assistance of a National Bank, if chartered. For one, I cannot and will not vote for him! My support shall be given to Mr. Butler in consequence of his uniformly advocating true democratic principles, which is the sheet anchor of our civil and religious liberties.

A VOTER.

### ADDRESS

#### To the people of the United States.

At a Meeting of Republican members of the Senate and House of Representatives held at the Capitol, July 6, 1838, the Hon. JOHN M. NILES, of Connecticut, and the Hon. CHARLES E. HAYNES, of Georgia, being Chairman, and the Hon. George M. Krim, of Pennsylvania, and the Hon. H. L. Turner, of Tennessee, acting as Secretaries, the Address to the People of the United States was received, and further considered; whereupon on motion of the Hon. Hiram Gray, of New York, it was

Resolved, That the address be signed and published by the committee who have prepared it in behalf of the Republican members of Congress.

JNO. M. NILES, & Sec.  
CHS. E. HAYNES, & Chm.

### ADDRESS.

In a country advancing with the rapidity of our great changes, having a powerful control over its political relations and future destiny, must not unfrequently occur, which may make it the duty of public affairs, for the time, with the management to publish an exposition of their principles and purposes. Such are the changes which have taken place within the last few years, and which have already had great effect on the political condition of the country, and are destined still to have much greater hereafter. Among these may be enumerated the final payment of the public debt, the expiration of the charter of the United States Bank, without renewal; the fall of the misnamed American system; the rise and progress of abolition and finally the stoppage of payment by the banks, with the consequent embarrassment to the community, and in the fiscal action of the Government. Never, in so short a period, since the commencement of the Government, have so many events, destined to effect so mighty a change in our political condition, occurred. That their first effect would be to unsettle public opinion was to be expected; and accordingly there never was a time when the political elements of the country were in a state of greater confusion, and when it was more important that those who are entrusted with the management of public affairs should resort to first principles, and give a full and explicit exposition of their views.

Actuated by these considerations, the Republican members of Congress, about to return to their constituents, propose to lay before them a brief exposition of the principles by which they have been guided, and intend hereafter to be governed, on some of the most important measures of public policy acted on, and to be acted on, in the councils of the General Government.

We are deeply sensible that too much has been expected from the deliberations of Congress. A numerous and powerful party has induced a large portion of the people to look alone to the Congress of the United States for relief. They are taught to believe that from these alone can emanate the measures required to restore the country to peace, quiet, and happiness, unmindful that we have a written Constitution to control those who administer the various departments of the General Government. Many appear to think that Congress can do any and every thing called for at this novel crisis in the affairs of the country. To guard against the further progress of this fatal delusion, and to exonerate ourselves from unreasonable responsibility, we propose, at the threshold of this address, to present a concise history, touching the character of the Federal Constitution, and the origin of the two great political parties which have divided and will probably forever divide, the American people.

There were radical differences of opinion on the very foundations which formed the Constitution. They laid the foundation of those parties which have at intervals ever since agitated, and at this moment deeply agitate the whole country.

A portion of the convention, from a strong partiality for the British form of Government, desired to approximate as near that system as public opinion in America would allow. From them came proposals for a President and Senate for life, elections for long terms, and other fundamental arrangements, which should remove the Government as far as possible from popular control. Another portion, having more confidence in the intelligence and virtue of the people, advocated the principle of making the executive and legislative branches elective for short terms. After the Constitution was formed, those two parties differed widely in the views they took of the tendency of the Government; the one believing that it was towards consolidation, and the other to disunion; and the one accordingly believing that the danger was despotism in the head, and the other anarchy in the members. Hence the different light in which the two parties viewed the character of the system in its character, and the one believing that the sovereignty resided in the people, and the other believing that it resided in the Government. The American people in the aggregate, to promote the interest of the majority, instead of the several States composing it.

When the Government was put in operation under the new Constitution, each party adopted rules of construction calculated to secure their peculiar objects, and advance their cherished principles, in its practical operation.

Unfortunately, the execution of certain vital parts of the system was entrusted to men who had no faith in its stability, without essential changes, removing it further from the influence of the people and the work to accomplish, by a broad construction, that which was, in their opinion, essential to the continued existence of the Government, but a maintenance through a direct appeal to the States and the people for amendments to the Constitution. Out of this design grew the funding system of the first Secretary of the Treasury, and other measures intended to create improper action of the Government.

The other party maintaining their faith in the Constitution as it is, insisted that the Constitution should be construed strictly according to its honest meaning as adopted by the States; and that changes in the system, when found necessary, should be sought through applications for amendments, rather than through new, vague, and latitudinous constructions which, in effect, would accumulate unlimited powers in a Government notoriously limited by those who had created it. The rapid and resolute encroachment of a few years greatly alarmed and pure Government, controlled by the public will. They organized themselves for constitutional resistance, proportioned to the character and extent of actual and threatened usurpations, and threw out, from the midst of that day, luminous expositions of the real origin, true character, and ultimate objects of our Constitution. After a fearful struggle, success crowned their efforts; the Government was wrested from the hands of those whose principles were monarchical and aristocratic; the letter of the Constitution, and the honest meaning of those who adopted it, became the practical rule of construction; and public opinion, expressed by the unbiased representatives of the people and the States, through the different branches of the Government, was recognized as the only legitimate governing power.

We adhere to the constitutional doctrines of the Republican party of 1798-9; we adopt the rule of strict construction, we maintain, as the only true and safe one, applicable to our Constitution; we reject the assumption that the people have not the requisite intelligence and virtue to choose competent managers of public affairs, and direct them when necessary.

These are the principles upon which we would have our government administered, and a reference to our views upon the great and agitating topics of the day will, we trust, show that we are disposed to carry these principles into practice by our public acts.

The leading question which now divides the two parties of the country is, the re-establishment of a Bank of the United States. The first bank was a measure of that party, which deemed it necessary to devise other means than public opinion and the suffrages of the people, to secure a stable Government. It was condemned by the people, and was required to wind up, after living out its chartered existence. Far different were the considerations, which led to the establishment of a second bank. It was thought to be necessary, perhaps from conclusions too hastily drawn, as an instrument to compel the State banks to resume specie payments and as a fiscal agent, to keep and transfer the funds of the United States. This bank was also condemned by the people, and its charter suffered to expire without renewal. The question is, shall we have a third bank, after two have been established by the public authorities, and condemned by the people? There are many of us who have always believed a Bank of the U. S. to be unconstitutional. They look upon the power to create corporations, except in and for the District of Columbia, as a substantive power reserved wholly to the States. They find that the convention which formed the Constitution, refused to insert clauses delegating to Congress the general power to create corporations. In the discussions of the friends and foes of the Constitution, through the press of the country, and in the State conventions prior to its adoption, they do not find it alluded on either side, that it conferred such a power on Congress. They think that the absence of any grant of power in the Constitution ought, itself, to be conclusive; but when, in addition to this, it has been proved by the declaration of late years that the proposition was actually voted down in Convention, and that both parties were therefor silent on the subject, it seems to them impossible to doubt that the power was not granted, but was purposely withheld.

They believe that Congress has no constitutional power to regulate credit in any of the States; that the rights of each citizen, and of every association of citizens, to use their credit, is not derived originally from the laws; but is an incident to property in the social state; that the citizens of the States possessed it in the most plenary manner; that each or any of them, singly or associated, could issue their notes, without limitation, until the right was taken away by the laws of the States against private banking; that, to restore the right, nothing is necessary but the repeal of those laws; and that the granting of bank charters is but a restoration of the right to the favored individuals, in a modified form. They maintain that the General Government, having no agency of right, or in fact, in restraining the use of credit, or forbidding private banking within the States, has no power to restore the right, in either a general or modified form, the power belonging exclusively to the States which took it away. And they think Congress has as rightful power to abrogate all the State laws against banking, and restore the right to every citizen, without restraint, as they have to restore it in a qualified shape under the condition of a bank charter.

These, and many other arguments of great force, may be employed to prove the unconstitutionality of a Bank of the United States. But whatever may have been, or are now several conclusions upon that point, we unanimously concur in the opinion that the re-establishment of a Bank of the United States is unnecessary, inexpedient and dangerous to the public liberty.

A few years' experience has given much additional force to the arguments originally urged against such an institution. A leading argument in favor of it, is that the State banks, of themselves, are incompetent to manage their affairs prudently, or to maintain specie payments and preserve a sound currency; and that a Bank of the U. S. is necessary to check and control them. Do those who use this argument reflect that it is an argument against popular Government itself? The people constitute the governing power in the United States, and it is their authority that the State banks are created. This argument assumes that the people are incompetent to check and control a class of institutions which they create, and that a new agent, unknown to the States and irresponsible to them or to the people, must be introduced, to save them from the disastrous consequences of their own acts.

Is this a Republican doctrine? On the contrary it is not the leading argument in favor of monopoly and absolute power, through the world? Why do kings reign, and princes exercise absolute dominion, but because the people are assumed to be incompetent to act wisely, and protect themselves against the evil consequences of their own ignorance and error?

Assume that the State banks are incompetent to the ends for which they are created, and will necessarily run into periodical excesses, entailing great evils upon the country, to what source would a Republican look for a remedy? Would he say that the people cannot be trusted to amend their own institutions, and that we must have an irresponsible corporation to prevent these evils?—Would he not rather justly conclude that the banking system itself was defective, and undertake to reform it, so as to bring it under the control of the people, through their constitutional organs, rather than to assume that it cannot be regulated otherwise than by the introduction of a power competent to contend for mastery with the Government itself?

We reject both the premises and the conclusions. We believe our representative and popular Governments in the States, who created these institutions, fully competent to modify and reform them, and to impose all these checks and restraints upon them which the banking system is capable of receiving.

To awaken the people to a due sense of the magnitude of that power which the advocates of a Bank of the United States would create, let us look at the amount of "men and money" which they propose to make dependent upon one institution. The number of State banks and branches now is 829. The number of presidents, directors, and other officers, is not over estimated at eight thousand, two hundred. The number of stockholders may be safely estimated at three hundred and twenty thousand; and the number of debtors, exclusive of stockholders, at six hundred and fifty thousand. The aggregate of these is near a million of persons, whose business relations and pecuniary interests are directly involved. The capital of all the banks is about \$497,630,776. Here, then, we have a mass of about one million of persons, and money and credit to an amount exceeding five hundred millions of dollars, which are, in a great degree dependent upon the operations of this bank credit system.

Left to be governed by the general laws of trade and credit these elements of power may continue to be comparatively harmless in their effects upon our political institutions but what does the opposition party propose?

It proposes, by the establishment of a national bank, to increase, concentrate, and combine those elements in one corporation. The project is not merely to establish a new bank, with an immense capital, but it is also to give a head and manager to the million of persons and five hundred millions of dollars embraced in the existing State banks.

When these things are considered, the United States created, with the next term of this, the number of State banks and branches, will be increased to about one million, and the property attached will be about \$1,000,000,000. OVID P. BROWN, Clerk of the Senate, 1838-39. [Printer's fee \$10 per page.]

was any cause for fear on those occasions, how ought Republicans to feel now, when it is proposed to put near one million of individuals, and more than \$500,000,000, under the substantial dominion of one corporation? The president of the late Bank of the United States testified, upon a public occasion, that there were few of the State banks which it could not have crushed had it been so disposed. The power of the proposed new bank will be greater, and every new State bank which has been or may be established, will add to its power by increasing the number of its dependants, and enlarging the sphere of its influence.

What, under such a system, is to become of the independence of the several States, and their right and power to regulate and control their own institutions? Will the State banks be governed by the States which created them, or will they look for their superior to the monarch of the great bank credit system, on whom the inexorable and inevitable laws of credit and of trade confer the power to crush or arrest them, according to his uncontrollable will?

Every year increases the danger of establishing such an institution; for every year adds to the number of State banks, which must of necessity be its subordinates and dependants. If it ever be established, every bank within the States will necessarily become the ally and citadel of this central power. Surely it is enough that the unchangeable laws of credit and trade subject the distant State banks to the influence of one common centre.—That consequence is inevitable, and unless trade should be more extensively diffused must be borne.

But, as friends of the rights and independence of the States, can we desire to see this subjection made more absolute and degrading by artificial regulations? Least of all, can we desire to see the administration of the laws of credit and trade placed in hands which are not only independent of the States, but of all that is popular in the General Government? When a guaranty can be discovered against the frailties of our nature, mankind may be safe under absolute dominion. When directors of banks can be selected from a superior order, than the existence of a bank of the United States, may be compatible with the rights of the States, and the liberty, prosperity, and happiness of the American people.

That there are some advantages to be derived from a Bank of the United States cannot be denied. A species of paper, answering the purposes of money, and so nearly uniform in value as to be available at par throughout the Union, is, for many purposes, a great public convenience. But what Republican would purchase it at the hazard of his liberty, especially when he sees that an effective substitute may be obtained without it? It may be doubted whether such a bank could now be of any real utility in equalizing domestic exchanges.

That which is now very generally called the difference of exchange, is, in reality, but a difference in the value of the prevailing paper currency at different points. To put an end to that, requires no Bank of the United States. It is as vanishing as fast as the banks resume specie payments, and we trust, will soon cease throughout the Union without the agency of any coercive power whatever. The real difference of exchange will then remain, consisting of the cost of transporting specie or specie funds from one place to another. In this business there has been heretofore, and will soon be again, vast competition, which will reduce the expense to the lowest amount for which the operation can be performed. For the country, this is the safest basis on which it can rest. If a great national bank be established, having, as it must, the mastery of the whole banking system of the Union, it will be strong enough to prescribe the rates of exchange, and drive competition out of the market, not by reducing the price, but by a wave of its scepter.

If it were to indicate to the State banks that exchange was considered, it would be to have a competitor, they must necessarily submit to the will of this legal superior, and withdraw from the business. Would it be safer to have exchanges regulated, and the price fixed by the president of a bank, whose first object is to make as much money as possible, than by the general laws of trade, which know no selfishness, and have no favorites? Not only would it be more safe, but it can scarcely be doubted that a general competition among banks and individuals, may that the whole process and the necessary machinery is well understood, would secure to the country lower rates.

The same state of things renders a bank less useful to the Government, as an agent to transfer its funds from one section of the Union to another, than it was when the late Bank of the U. S. was established, and for many years afterwards. Competent as we are for this purpose may now be found in the State banks and in private banks; and these facilities are multiplied even more rapidly than the growth of our country.—This argument in favor of a national bank has, therefore, ceased to have the weight to which it was formerly entitled, and goes but a little way to counterbalance the many fatal objections to such an institution. It can only be said, with truth, that it would save some trouble to the officers and clerks of the Treasury Department; and that it is the only just extent of the argument.

The same reasons which oppose the establishment of a Bank of the United States, are equally hostile to a Treasury Bank, or any machinery in the nature of a bank, attached to the Treasury Department. The former would be the creation of an independent and irresponsible power in the country, whose inclination and interest would generally prompt it to support a friendly Executive, and whose power would almost certainly be great enough to assert itself in concert with the Executive, with power to give him strength in proportion to its capital and the extent of its machinery. Both alike are calculated to enlarge Executive power; and although a Treasury bank would, in theory, at least, be more controllable by the popular will, constituting a part of the Government, both are to be dreaded and rejected alike by those who would preserve the simplicity and purity of our institutions. But as we do not know of any advocates, in the Republican party, of a Treasury Bank, though such a scheme is most unjustly imputed to them, we deem it unnecessary to multiply arguments against it.

The cleanness of our system of Government, compared with the monarchical systems of the old world, has been one of its chief recommendations to the favor of mankind. This is one of its characteristics which every Republican will strive to maintain. Injurious legislation, and the spirit of speculation in merchandise and public lands, had, within a few of the last years, brought into the Treasury a redundancy of revenue. As a natural consequence, this influx has been followed by loose and extravagant appropriations by Congress, and an increased expenditure. It is an inevitable law of our system of Government, and perhaps of every other, that if it collects much, it must expend much. It could not be safely tolerated if it were practicable, that the Government should collect hundreds of millions from the people, to be retained by it in the shape of money or property. It must always expend what it collects. The only effective remedy, therefore, for an extravagant expenditure, is to reduce the supply. For the accomplishment of this great object, the country must look to those who strive to reduce the receipts of the Government to its absolute wants; to prevent extravagance, by withholding the means; to preserve the purity of the public affairs, by keeping them out of temptation; to enforce economy, by making it impossible for the Government not to be economical.

It is in vain to oppose little appropriations of money, when there are millions of surplus in the Treasury. If there be a surplus it will be expended, and to be expended it must be appropriated. Keep the

[Continued on 4th page.]